09/625,769

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application Number

TRANSMITTAL

SEP 2 7 2004 E FORM			Filing Date		July 26, 2000		
			First Named Inventor		Chiyoaki lijima		
(to be used for initial filing)			Art Unit		2871		
A MADEM!			Examiner Name		SCHECHTER, Andrew M		
Total Number of Pages		Attorney Docket Number		9319S-000142			
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal Form		☐ Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)		
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Reply		Petition			Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Issue Fee Transmittal; Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance; return post card		
☐ Information Disclosure Statement		,					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remar	rks				
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application							
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm or Individual name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C		Attorney Name G. Gregory Schivley		1	eg. No. 7,382	
Signature	D. Juga / Churchen						
Date	September 27, 2004						
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSIPH/MAILING							
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.							
Typed or printed name G. Gregory §		enivley/	11		Express Mail Label No.	EV 531 989 994 US (9/27/2004)	
Signature		· hugs	ay/ /Chive	4	Date	September 27, 2004	
This collection of information	on is required by 37/CFR	1/5. The information	ation is required to obtain or	r retain a ber	nefit by the public	which is to file (and by the USPTO to	

rns collection of information is required by 3/CFR 1/5. The prioring pip is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. /22 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burgen, should be sented the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

09/625,769

Filing Date:

7/26/2000

Applicant:

Chiyoaki lijima

Group Art Unit:

2871

Examiner:

Andrew M. Schechter

Title:

LCD WITH DIFFUSER HAVING PARTICULAR HAZE

VALUE AND DIFFUSER-REFLECTOR DISTANCE, AND

REDUCED PARALLAX

Attorney Docket:

9319S-000142

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or

that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the nonaddressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600